

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

The Neighborhood Learning Place

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Lesson matches original description	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>	Criminal Background Checks	<i>In Compliance</i>
Recruiting Materials	<i>Satisfactory</i>	Instruction is clear	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>	Health/safety laws & regulations	<i>In Compliance</i>
Academic Program	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Time on task is appropriate	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>	Financial viability	<i>In Compliance</i>
Progress Reporting	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	Student/instructor ratio: 3-1:1	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>		

The Neighborhood Learning Place is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the onsite monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report. As such, The Neighborhood Learning Place has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: The Neighborhood Learning Place
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 7, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<p>BOTH of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p>ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>) -Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>) -Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tutor resumes/applications -Tutor evaluations -Orientation PowerPoint -Orientation training attendance verification 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Provider's application states tutors must be certified teachers, however, only 3 out of 8 tutors meet this qualification. While the remaining tutors meet IDOE's minimum tutor qualifications, tutors must also meet the provider's minimum tutor requirements; -Provider's application states that "mandatory in-service meetings are held regularly for the purpose of professional growth", however, the only training provided to tutors was the initial orientation for tutors; -Tutor evaluations include a review of how effectively tutors demonstrate innovative thinking, use new tutoring skills, demonstrate problem solving skills, and generate creative ideas and solutions.
Recruiting materials	<p>TWO of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Recruitment brochures -Program description for parents 		X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Recruitment brochures provide an appropriate overview of programming offered by provider; -Program description for parents is appropriate.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Academic Program	<p>ONE of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors</p> <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p>ONE of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.</p>	<p>-Individual Lesson Plan -Description of lesson's connection to Indiana Academic Standards</p>	X		<p>-Lesson plans are individualized based on student's pre-assessment scores. Although the curriculum used in the lesson plan submitted matches the curriculum that was observed during monitoring visit, the lesson plan only includes workbook pages student will complete during the lesson and teacher ratings on student mastery. Lesson plans do not include information regarding the standards or objectives to be covered, materials being used, or provide the structure of the lesson (which should incorporate the seven components of the "Direct Instructional Model" described in the application);</p> <p>-Lessons connect to Indiana Academic Standards.</p>
Progress Reporting	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <p>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent</p>	<p>-SES Contracts -SES Agreements -Progress reports</p>	X		<p>-According to at least one of the two districts this provider served, progress reports were not submitted in the timeframe agreed to in the SES Contract or SES Agreements;</p> <p>-Progress reports submitted do not include assessment results (i.e. pre-test scores or student master scores). In addition, student goals are not listed on progress reports. The section designated for student goals is blank on all progress reports. Also, comments regarding student progress on goals are vague. For example, some progress reports list word attack, reading comprehension, progress on word comprehension as a description of student progress with out providing an indication of the degree to which the student has made progress in these particular skill areas. Lastly, many progress reports lack specific information regarding gains in academic achievement that the student has made. For instance, some reports list</p>

					“sequencing of events in story” or phonetic development as a description of the gains students have made but do not provide more descriptive details about student achievement in these skill areas.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p>ALL of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider’s pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Individual learning plans -Pre-test scores -Description of learning plan development process -Description of assessments’ correlation to Indiana Academic Standards 	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explanation of learning plan development describes how lessons are selected for each student and how lessons are individualized for each student. However, the description does not explain how a learning plan (which is not the same as a lesson plan) is developed for a student; -While learning plans include daily logs regarding the workbook pages completed during lessons and tutor ratings on student mastery of each lesson, they are not really individual learning plans in that they are not designed strategically for the entire duration of SES and do not include specific, measurable goals based on the initial pre-assessment or include specific strategies to help the student achieve those goals. -Evidence and explanation provided demonstrates assessment’s correlation to academic standards.

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: The Neighborhood Learning Place
SITE: Village Elementary School
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): Tutors in Art Room
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 4

DATE: March 25, 2008
REVIEWER: S.T. & K.S.
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 3:05 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>-Students worked in groups of 2-3 with tutors (there was one student who worked individually with a tutor) on worksheets and workbook pages that focused on language arts activities from the provider's curriculum. Each student had an individualized lesson plan that highlighted specific workbook pages he/she would complete during the tutoring session. Tutors reviewed directions with students and then allowed students to complete independent exercises. Tutors checked and scored each students work when students completed their lessons.</p> <p>-Some of the observed lesson was in line with the provider's application. For instance, lesson plans included materials that were from the curriculum described in the provider's application. In addition, tutors were observed reviewing student work and providing a mastery rating as described in the application. However, other parts of the observed lesson were not in line with the provider's application. For example, the application describes that lessons will be conducted using the seven components of the “Direct Instructional Model”. However, while tutors did provide immediate feedback and also provided for independent practice time (two of the model's components), the other remaining components were missing as tutors were not observed providing an anticipatory set, communicating objectives, demonstrating skills, providing guided practice or providing closure.</p>
Instruction is clear		X			<p>-Most tutors did not communicate what was to be learned or share the objectives that would be achieved in each lesson. Instead, when students finished one lesson and began another, tutors reviewed the workbook page directions with the student rather than sharing overall lesson objectives;</p>

					<p>-While it was clear the curriculum materials each student completed were individualized for each student based on gaps identified by the pre-test, instruction was not always individualized, adjusted or modified for each student. Instruction did not appear to vary depending on student needs as typically the same method of explanation was used when students provided incorrect answers;</p> <p>-Most tutors reviewed workbook page directions with students but did not provide methods of scaffolded instruction when introducing new or difficult concepts or implement all components of the “Direct Instructional Model” as described in the application (see “Lesson matches original description in provider application” section).</p>
COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Time on task is appropriate		X			<p>-Some students stayed on task and appeared to be engaged in their lessons during the majority of the session. However, there were several students that had difficulty remaining on task particularly when the tutor was working with another student. These students sometimes wandered the room periodically (under the pretense of throwing trash away or sharpening a pencil), watched other groups, or used other forms of distraction when the tutor’s attention was not directed towards them;</p> <p>-Students became even more off task during the timeframe leading up to the end of the tutoring session and the transition to library time (a non SES component of the session). During this time, the noise level increased, students began to socialize more and became increasingly disengaged with their lessons.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			<p>-Tutors appeared to be knowledgeable about the content of lessons completed. Tutors also appropriately met provider’s mastery rating requirement by scoring each student’s work when they completed an assignment (as described in the application);</p> <p>-Tutors did not implement all components of the “Direct Instructional Model” as described in the application (see “Lesson matches original description in provider application” section). In addition, tutors did not always use effective strategies to promote time on task or behavior management when students were off task. Typically when a student was off task, tutors used the same method of redirection repeatedly even when the method appeared to be ineffective (based on the number of times the student was redirected for the same behavior).</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 3-1:1			X		<p>-Ratio matches that reported in original provider application;</p> <p>-As described in the application, small group instruction was observed.</p>

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: The Neighborhood Learning Place
REVIEWER: S.T.

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: April 7, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	ALL of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks	X	
Health and safety laws and regulations	ONE of the following: -Student release policy(ies) <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Evacuation Procedure Map -Student Release Policy	X	
Financial viability	ONE of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage <i>In addition to:</i> ONE of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of liability insurance -Tax returns for two years	X	